REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

These remarks are made in response to the Office Action of April 5, 2007 (hereinafter Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due. The Office is expressly authorized, however, to charge any deficiencies or credit any over-payments to Deposit Account 50-0951.

In the Office Action, Claims 1-2, 4, 6-8, 10, 12-14, and 16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,867,162 to O'Leary, *et al.* (hereinafter O'Leary), in view of U.S. Patent 5,726,688 to Siefert, *et al.* (hereinafter Siefert). Claims 5, 11, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over O'Leary in view of Siefert, and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 6,901,559 to Blum, *et al.* (hereinafter Blum). Additionally, Claims 5-6 and 15-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite.

Rejections Under §112

As previously noted, Claims 5-6 and 15-16 were rejected as being indefinite. In particular, the claims were rejected for reciting the limitation "second criteria" without sufficient antecedent basis. In this response, Claims 5-6 and 15-16 have been amended by replacing the term "second criteria" with the term "second attribute," as recited in respective base Claims 1 or 14. In view of these amendments, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of this rejection.

Amendments to the Claims

Applicants have amended the claims to emphasize certain aspects of the claims. In particular, Claims 1, 7, and 14 have been amended to recite the limitation that user-named and system-named variables, prior to presentation, are sorted according to a priority attribute and then according to a second attribute. Additionally, Claims 2, 11, and 12 have been amended to maintain consistency among the claims or to correct typographical errors. All amendments are fully supported in the Specification. No new subject matter has been added by this amendment.

6

Aspects of the Claims

Prior to discussing the cited references, it may be useful to discuss certain aspects of the claims. The claims recite a system and method for arranging user-modified variable names in a presentation list. For example, Claim 1 recites method that comprises the steps of receiving a system request to display variables in the presentation list and simultaneously presenting both user-named variables and system-named variables. The presentation can comprise presenting each of the user-named variables in a first region of the list and each of the system-named variables in a second region of the list distinct from the first region. (See, e.g., Specification, para [0014].) Additionally or alternatively, the method can present the user-named variable in a first format and the system-named variables in a second format distinct from the first format. (See, e.g., Specification, para. [0015], [0018], and [0019].) The method can also include the step of sorting the variables according to a first attribute and then sorting the variables by a second attribute prior to presenting the variables, where the first attribute indicates a priority of the variables, and where the user-named variables have a greater priority than the system-named variables. (See, e.g., Specification, para. [0004] and [0016].)

The Claims Define Over the Cited References

As previously noted, independent Claims 1, 7, and 14 were rejected as being unpatentable under O'Leary in view of Siefert. O'Leary discloses systems and methods for displaying and editing picklists in a drop-down menu of a graphical user interface (GUI) displayed on a computer. (See Abstract.) Siefert discloses a predictive and adaptive interface for a computer program, based on user interaction with the computer program. (See Abstract.) However, Applicant respectfully disagrees and submits that O'Leary and Siefert, separately or in combination, fail to teach or suggest each and every element of the claimed invention.

First, O'Leary fails to disclose or suggest a system or method for arranging user-modified variable names in a presentation list. O'Leary only discloses the editing of the

number of references presented in a GUI menu, not their arrangement. For example, as shown in FIG. 3, O'Leary discloses that the number of references shown in section 308 can be altered according to user selections. Specifically, the portion of O'Leary asserted in the Office Action to recite the limitation in the claims only discloses allowing a user to selectively remove references included in a picklist not to rearrange their presentation. (See, e.g., col. 2, lines 28-31.) In contrast, the claims recite the limitation of actually adjusting the arrangement of the presented variables in the presentation list as a result of the sorting step.

Second, O'Leary fails to disclose or suggest a system or method in which the variables are sorted according to a priority attribute and other secondary attributes. O'Leary, as previously discussed, only discloses the removal of references from the picklist according to user selections. Nowhere does O'Leary disclose or suggest that a variable can have any type of attribute associated with a priority for presenting the variable. Furthermore, O'Leary fails to disclose or suggest any type of sorting of variables in the presentation list. O'Leary only discloses that the existing reference list is amended as new references are accessed by a user. Specifically, the portion of O'Leary recited in the Office Action to disclose the limitation in the claims only discloses that when a new reference is accessed by a user, the reference is added to the top of the reference list automatically unless the reference is equivalent to another reference already in the presentation list. (See, e.g., Col. 4, lines 41-56). However, nowhere does O'Leary disclose or suggest that existing references in such a presentation list would be re-sorted based on the new reference. In contrast, the claims recite the limitation that variables in a presentation list would be resorted in response to a user specifying a name for a variable. As recited in the claims, the entire presentation list is re-sorted and the newly user-named variable would be placed in its proper position according to its attributes, not just simply placed on top of the list, as disclosed by O'Leary.

8

Finally, such features are not taught or suggested by Siefert. As previously noted, Siefert discloses a system and method for presenting menu options based on use of the option. Nowhere does Siefert teach or suggest that variables can be re-sorted or re-ordered according to a priority attribute, regardless of use. Furthermore, Siefert fails to disclose any type of priority attribute.

Accordingly, both O'Leary and Siefer, alone or in combination, fail to disclose each and every element of Claims 1, 7, and 14, as amended. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claims 1, 7, and 14 define over the cited references. Furthermore, as the remaining dependent claims each depend from one of independent Claims 1, 7, and 14 while reciting additional features, the Applicants also respectfully submit that the dependent claims likewise define over the cited references.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that this application is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution 103(a of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: **June 5, 2007**   _____/Richard A. Hinson/_____
                                                Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
                                                Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652
                                                Eduardo Quinones, Registration No. 58,575
                                                AKERMAN SENTERFITT
                                                Customer No. 40987
                                                Post Office Box 3188
                                                West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
                                                Telephone: (561) 653-5000

{WP401709;1}